

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application prior to this amendment.

Claims 1-19 were rejected.

Claim 9 has been changed from an independent claim to a dependent claim and a new claim 20 has been added.

Claims 1, 3 and 9 have been amended to clarify the interaction between the various units or steps recited in applicant's claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 as amended is respectfully requested for the reasons explained below.


***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12, 13 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,217.

Applicant's claim 1 recites four steps that involve:

- a document processing device,
- a workstation,
- a document data file,
- a first interface between the document processing device and the workstation,
- a user interface to the workstation.

The diagram shows elements recited in claim 1 and how they interact.



Applicant's claim 1 recites among other steps the following three steps designated as "a", "b", and "c" for ease of reference in the discussion below.

- a) "locating a connection to a document processing device and activating a first interface between said document processing device and a workstation whereby said workstation can access a plurality of operational setting of said document processing device;"
- b) "providing a user interface to said workstation, whereby a user can through said user interface and said first interface select operational setting for the document processing device;"

c) "communicating said particular location of the document data file to the predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with operational settings selected by the user."

In step "a" quoted above, a first interface is opened between a workstation and the operational settings in a document processing device.

In step "b" quoted above, a user selects operational settings. The claim recites that the settings are selected through an interface to the workstation and through the first interface.

In step "c" the location of the document data file is communicated to the document processing device and the device is activated with the operational settings.

The Examiner referred to column 7 lines 15-31 of the Lahey reference where the "infoPrint Submit Software" is described in the Lahey reference. The software described in the Lahey reference is described in Lahey column 7 lines 22-25 as follows:

"The client computer ... transmits this translated job ticket ... along with the items identified in the item records ... to the InfoPrint MPC server ... over the network. The InfoPrint MPC server ... uses the information in the translated job ticket ... to process the transmitted items ... and generate printer files based thereon."

Thus, in Lahey, the actual data file and the info that indicates how this information should be processed both are transferred to the print server. Note that the above quoted language from Lahey states that the computer transmits the job ticket along with the items identified in the item records. In the applicant's system, it is the location of the file, and not the file itself, that is transmitted to the to the document processing device. Furthermore, in the applicant's system, a first interface is opened between the workstation and the operational settings in the document processing device. This does not occur in the Lahey reference.

The independent claims subject to the rejection discussed above are claims 1, 9 and 12. It is noted that claim 9 has been made into a dependent claim, that is dependent upon claim 1. Claim 12 is an independent claim and it contains the limitation that only the location of the document file and not the document file itself is sent to the document processing device. Thus claim 12 distinguishes from the Lahey reference for the same reason as discussed above relative to claim 1.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 10, 13 and 15-17 are dependent claims and these claims distinguish from the references for the same reasons as discussed above relative to their parent claims.

Newly added claim 20 is patentable for the same reason as explained above relative to claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 3, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (US patent 6,166,826).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this reference for the following two reasons.

First, claims 3, 4 and 7 are dependent claims and hence they are patentable for the same reason as are the parent claims that were discussed above.

Second, the Yokoyama reference describes a system whereby a user can check the status of files of documents to be printed that are "stored in the printing apparatus" (column 2 line 28 of Yokoyama). In applicant's system, the documents to be printed are not stored in the document processing device (for example, in the printer). Thus this reference shows an entirely different system from that described by the applicant.

**Conclusion**

In summary, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that a telephone interview would be helpful in advancing the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



---

Elmer W. Galbi  
Reg. No. 19,761

**Customer No. 20575**  
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 222-3613